will not be changed after the date set for receipt of proposals.

[62 FR 4472, Jan. 30, 1997, as amended at 67 FR 61520 Oct. 1, 2002]

1872.403 Methods of evaluation.

Alternative methods are available to initiate the evaluation of proposals received in response to an AO. These are referred to as the Advisory Subcommittee Evaluation Process, the Contractor Evaluation Process, and the Government Evaluation Process. In all processes, a subcommittee of the appropriate Program Office Steering Committee will be formed to categorize the proposals. Following categorization, those proposals still in consideration will be processed to the selection official.

1872.403–1 Advisory subcommittee evaluation process.

(a) Evaluation of scientific and/or technological merit of proposed investigations is the responsibility of an advisory subcommittee of the Steering Committee. The subcommittee constitutes a peer group qualified to judge the scientific and technological aspects of all investigation proposals. One or more subcommittees may be established depending on the breadth of the technical or scientific disciplines inherent in the AO's objectives. Each subcommittee represents a discipline or grouping of closely related disciplines. To maximize the quality of the subcommittee evaluation and categorization, the following conditions of selection and appointment should be considered.

(1) The subcommittee normally should be established on an ad hoc basis.

(2) Qualifications and acknowledgment of the professional abilities of the subcommittee members are of primary importance. Institutional affiliations are not sufficient qualifications.

(3) The executive secretary of the subcommittee must be a full-time NASA employee.

(4) Subcommittee members should normally be appointed as early as possible and prior to receipt of proposals.

(5) Care must be taken to avoid conflicts of interest. These include financial interests, institutional affiliations, professional biases and associations, as well as familiar relationships. Conflicts could further occur as a result of imbalance between Government and non-Government appointees or membership from institutions representing a singular school of thought in discipline areas involving competitive theories in approach to an investigation.

(6) The subcommittee should convene as a group in closed sessions for proposal evaluation to protect the proposer's proprietary ideas and to allow frank discussion of the proposer's qualifications and the merit of the proposer's ideas. Lead review responsibility for each proposal may be assigned to members most qualified in the involved discipline. It is important that each proposal be considered by the entire subcommittee.

(b) It may not be possible to select a subcommittee fully satisfying all of the conditions described in paragraph (a) of this section. It is the responsibility of the nominating and appointing officials to make trade-offs, where necessary, among the criteria in paragraph (a) of this section. This latitude permits flexibility in making decisions in accord with circumstances of each application. In so doing, however, it is emphasized that recognized expertise in evaluating dissimilar proposals is essential to the continued workability of the investigation acquisition process.

(c) Candidate subcommittee members should be nominated by the office having responsibility for the evaluation. Nominations should be approved in accordance with NMI 1150.2, ''Establishment, Operation, and Duration of NASA Advisory Committees.'' The notification of appointment should specify the duration of assignment on the subcommittee, provisions concerning conflicts of interest, and arrangements regarding honoraria, per diem, and travel when actually employed.

(d) It is important that members of the subcommittee be formally instructed as to their responsibilities with respect to the investigation acquisition process, even where several or all of the members have served previously. This briefing of subcommittee members should include: